



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The salvation of Europe and the Christian world will not come of their being girt with swords like brigands, \* \* not of their rushing to kill their brethren across the sea; but, on the contrary, it will come of their renouncing that survival of barbarism, patriotism, and in this renunciation disarming to show the oriental nations an example no more of savage patriotism and ferocity, but of that brotherly life taught us by Christ."

#### LETTER FROM THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND TO THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES.

The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, assembled in Nottingham, March 9th to 12th, of this year 1896, to the Churches of Christ in the United States of America sends greeting. Grace, mercy and peace be with you from our Common Head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

DEAR BRETHREN: Among the many questions of supreme interest and importance in relation to the Kingdom of God which have been occupying our attention there is none which lies nearer to our hearts than the continuance of that love between England and America which has been growing strong for many years of increasing intercourse between us.

We rejoice that in the difficulty which arose during the closing days of 1895, between your government and ours, relative to Venezuela, the influence of the pulpit on both sides of the Atlantic was immediately and successfully exerted to repress angry feeling, and to declare that no difference must be allowed to be a cause of war; that there could be none which the Christian wisdom of the two nations could not peaceably settle.

We are anxious, as we are sure you are, to turn that expression of the best feeling and the clear conscience of the two nations into a basis of continued and honorable peace.

Your Congress and our House of Commons have declared themselves in favor of accepting the principle of Arbitration in settlement of differences between us.

Many of our most distinguished men in all departments of civil life—including the past and the present leaders of the House of Commons—have deliberately declared in favor of the principle, since the emergency of the Venezuelan difficulty.

It is, however, to the churches in the two lands that we look to sustain this purpose, and to urge political parties to accept it as a settled matter of Policy, and devise means for carrying it into effect.

We wish to pledge you, as we pledge ourselves, not to relax watchfulness and endeavor, until the principle of Arbitration in all our differences be embodied in a binding Treaty, and a permanent Tribunal of Arbitration be established.

We intend to send a copy of this our Memorial to our political leaders, and to give it all publicity, so as to bind ourselves to you as emphatically as we can. Should you find yourselves able to do something of the same sort in America we shall rejoice.

Again we assure you of our affection for you, and our unceasing prayers on your behalf. Among many memories we have in common, dear and sacred as they are, the closest tie which unites us—closer even than our blood relation—is this, that your churches and ours have a common origin, a common Martyr history, a common experience of missionary zeal and triumph, a common

enthusiasm for man and freedom, as well as a common type of religious doctrine, spiritual life, and ethical character.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

H. PRICE HUGHES, President.

CHAS. A. BERRY, Ex-President.

ALEX. MACKENNAL, Secretary.

#### THE WASHINGTON ARBITRATION CONFERENCE.

Reported for the ADVOCATE OF PEACE by Miss Martha D. Adams.

##### FIRST SESSION.

The Conference was called to order at 3 P. M., Wednesday, April 22, and the Call for the Conference was read by Hon. Gardiner G. Hubbard, chairman of the committee of arrangements. Mr. Hubbard then introduced as temporary chairman, Hon. John W. Foster, "the arbitrator between Japan and China."

MR. FOSTER: I can only thank the local committee for the honor which they have conferred upon me, and ask what is now the will of the Conference.

Upon motion, the Chair appointed a committee of five on permanent organization. The gentlemen named were Hon. C. P. Daly of New York, and Messrs. F. W. Woodward of Washington, W. C. Gray of Chicago, George E. Leighton of St. Louis, and Francis Wayland of New Haven.

Mr. Foster then spoke as follows:

*Gentlemen:* I have been requested by the local committee having charge in part of the arrangements for this Conference, and by the municipal authorities, to express their pleasure at your presence in this city, and to assure you of their desire to do all in their power to make your stay in the capital a pleasant and profitable one. They regret that the programme, which reflects the wishes of the committees of other cities rather than theirs, has so fully filled up the hours of your sojourn that little opportunity is afforded them to extend to you any formal evidences of their hospitable inclinations. They and the citizens generally will, I am sure, do all that your engagements in the Conference will permit to make amends for this apparent omission, and they heartily unite with me in wishing that your deliberations may result in great good to the cause which has brought you together. (Applause.)

I do not desire to anticipate the address which may be expected from the permanent president, whose name will soon be presented to you by the committee on organization. But I cannot refrain from expressing my pride at the record which our country has made in the past half-century of unbroken peace with the nations of the earth and of a steady adherence to the settlement of international differences by the pacific methods of arbitration (applause),—a record almost without parallel among the nations of the earth. You have not, therefore, assembled to recommend to your government any new departure in its policy on this subject, but rather to strengthen and confirm it in the policy so long and so consistently followed. Compulsory arbitration between nations presents problems and difficulties not easy of solution, and it will be a great gain to the general cause if, out of your deliberations, a plan shall be evolved which will meet the objections and solve the difficulties. It seems a utopian idea to anticipate the general disarmament.

ment of nations in our generation; and until barbarism and the spirit of conquest and oppression are banished from the earth, governments will be forced to maintain armies and navies. But certainly, among the peoples who profess to be governed by the principles of a common Christianity, and especially between nations kindred in lineage, language and institutions, a better method of adjusting the difficulties which must arise between them may be found than the bloody arbitrament of war.

The English-speaking race is by far the most numerous of the great Caucasian families, and to it is entrusted by Providence the highest interests of civilization and Christianity in the world. And if this Conference shall result in a permanent plan whereby these differences may be adjusted by arbitration, it will win for itself the name of one of the memorable assemblages of the earth. (Applause.)

The report of the committee on permanent organization was presented by Judge Daly as follows:

President, Hon. George W. Edmunds.

Vice Presidents: Alabama, Oscar R. Hundley; Arkansas, U. M. Rose; Connecticut, Charles Dudley Warner; Colorado, N. P. Hill; California, John T. Valentine; District of Columbia, W. J. Boardman; Delaware, Ignatius C. Grubb; Florida, V. B. Lamar; Georgia, N. J. Hammond; Illinois, Cyrus H. McCormick; Indiana, Gov. Claude Matthews; Iowa, Right Rev. William Stevens Perry; Kansas, Gov. E. W. Morrill; Kentucky, James P. Helm; Louisiana, Charles E. Fenner; Maryland, Ferdinand C. Latrobe; Massachusetts, Charles W. Eliot; Michigan, Gov. John J. Rich; Minnesota, Charles A. Pillsbury; Maine, Josiah Crosby; Mississippi, R. B. Fulton; Missouri, Henry Hitchcock; Montana, Guy William H. DeWitt; New York, Abram S. Hewitt; New Jersey, Charles E. Green; North Carolina, Julian S. Carr; New Hampshire, B. A. Kimball; Nebraska, Alvin Saunders; Nevada, J. W. Adams; North Dakota, H. C. Simmons; Ohio, Daniel P. Eells; Oregon, D. S. K. Buick; Oklahoma, H. W. Scott; Pennsylvania, C. C. Harrison; Rhode Island, Rowland Hazard; South Carolina, W. H. Brawley; South Dakota, Right Rev. W. H. Hare; Texas, Richard B. Hubbard; Tennessee, D. M. Key; Utah, George Q. Cannon; Vermont, U. A. Woodbury; Virginia, William M. Thornton; Washington, Gov. John H. McGraw; West Virginia, Gov. W. A. McCorkle; Wisconsin, Samuel D. Hastings; Wyoming, Gov. W. A. Richard.

Secretaries: Dr. Josiah Strong, New York, W. R. Thompson, Pittsburg, John Jay Edson, Washington.

The report of the committee was unanimously adopted.

MR. FOSTER: I desire to state, for the gentlemen who have had charge of the correspondence as to representation in this body, that the list of vice-presidents which has been read to you, is a genuine list of delegates, who have been invited and have accepted, from forty-six states and territories of this Union. (Applause.)

I will designate Dr. White of New York and Dr. Curry of Virginia to escort the president-elect to the chair.

PRESIDENT EDMUNDS was received with great applause, the members of the Conference rising to do him honor. Presented by Mr. Foster, Mr. Edmunds spoke as follows:

#### ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT EDMUNDS.

I have to thank you, gentlemen, for the very great honor your committee and yourselves by your vote, have

shown to me in asking me to preside over this most extraordinary assembly. It is undoubtedly safe to say that this assemblage, representing the largest civilized body of homogeneous men and women that exists on the globe, is extraordinary. The United States of America, I will state it modestly, is among the strongest of nations. It has the least reason of any of the great nations of the world, in the mere selfish and aggressive sense, to wish for arbitration about anything; for it is strong enough in any cause that is not absurdly wicked and unjust, to defend itself, to promote its policies and to carry out its wars with success. (Applause.) But it is the very strength that we have that should lead us to wish for peace, if our civilization amounts to anything. (Applause.) It is true, as has been said, that the idea of international arbitration is not a new one. No more is the idea of the Ten Commandments or the Lord's Prayer, which, repeated day after day, year after year, and century after century, seems in the minds of some to have failed of its best efficacy. And yet we know, as we look over long periods of time, that the world does grow better, and that a comparison of to-day with a hundred years ago, and still more with the centuries before us since civilization began, shows that, with all our drawbacks and all our failures and all our sorrows, the condition of mankind grows better and better as the years go on. It is only like the eddies in great streams that, rising in the mountains, flow to the boundless sea, backward for a little, but the current goes on. Now we come here in order that we may deepen the channels and strengthen the mighty course of civilization and religion and humanity, by doing what we may to promote and aid our government, and so far as our influence and example will do, our kindred government, to get a footing of practical arbitration that shall stand as the permanent means of peace between us, and finally between all nations. (Applause.)

It is something interesting to think of, in a pitiful way, that at this present moment of time, when there is almost universal peace over the globe among civilized peoples, there are more than four millions of men, in the prime of their manhood and strength, capable of assisting in the progress of the world by all the labors and arts and inventions of civilization, who are yet constantly under arms; and that more than a billion of money is drawn yearly from the toil and tears of the rest of mankind to support them in idleness. That is the mere selfish and business point of view. How much more pitiful is it to consider the misery and the horror that always must attend, as it always has, when the time of war does come. It is to help to do all this away and to leave the armies of the world, like the army of the United States, simply a police body to enforce what is philosophically and truly the real arbitration system of the United States and of all the States that compose it, the reign of law that we have with an army of twenty-five thousand men for seventy millions of us (Applause),—that we are gathered here.

I shall hope, gentlemen, that your deliberations will promote, as they must, the good end we have in view. But in order to promote it, it is not to-day nor to-morrow at this meeting, but all the time, that our influence must continue to be exerted. To accomplish great results, through processes that are somewhat difficult, but can be solved I am sure, it is necessary that the forces of public opinion shall be as constant and as persistent as the law

of gravitation. (Applause.) That makes empires of peace, that makes progress, that makes success. We must try to operate upon that force. And when we do, the time will come, within the lives of many who hear me, I certainly hope within the lives of all, that armies for aggressive purposes will be dissolved, and when the angel of peace shall blow always from her trumpet of fame and beauty, all over the world, the glad words, "Love thy country and every other, and wherever man dwells find a brother whom God hath related to thee." (Applause.)

THE CHAIR requested Mr. Hubbard to read a communication which had been received from the Chief Justice of the United States.

MR. HUBBARD: When the committee asked the Chief Justice to be present with us, he said that this was the only occasion during the past winter when he had hesitated to decline such an invitation, but that his health and business cares did not permit him to accept. His note, dated to-day, is as follows:

"I sincerely regret that official duties prevent me from being present at the Conference and personally expressing my sympathy with the great object in aid of which it has assembled." (Applause.)

MR. DODGE, of New York, moved that the chair be authorized to appoint a Committee on the Order of Business, to consist of five delegates; and a Committee on Resolutions, to consist of seven delegates, each committee to have the power to add to its numbers.

MR. SMALLEY, of St. Paul, suggested that the Committee on Resolutions be made so large as to represent different sections of the country. He advocated the appointment of one member from each state and territory represented.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN expressed the opinion that a larger committee would not be able to accomplish its work in the short time allowed for the Conference.

MR. KASSON, of Iowa, concurred in the suggestion for enlarging the committee. The importance of the subject demanded a larger representation of opinion in the Union. He preferred that the number of members should be increased, the Chair to designate members as he should obtain the requisite information. The approval or disapproval of this convention in the country, and its influence abroad, will depend upon the carefulness of the substance of our declaration and resolutions. The complete consideration of them by a larger committee will prevent foolish discussion on the floor and will bring us to a clearer conclusion. He moved as an amendment that the committee consist of eleven or thirteen members.

Mr. Dodge accepted the proposed amendment.

MR. SAYLOR, of Indiana, approved the suggestion for enlarging the committee. He moved, as an amendment, that the Chair from time to time shall add to the committee at least one from each state and territory represented, and that the committee so formed should be the standing committee on resolutions.

MR. THOM, of Virginia, moved as a substitute that the roll of states be called, and the gentlemen present from each state report to the Chair the name of a member who should serve on that committee.

MR. HUNDLEY, of Alabama, differed with the gentlemen who had proposed both the amendment and the substitute. The resolutions proposed would not go forth to the country as the resolutions of a committee merely, but would receive the stamp of the approval of this whole body of delegates. If the deliberations of the Conference

were to be of value, the preparation of resolutions should be placed in the hands of a committee of such number as might be effective. The question being called for, a vote was taken on the substitute amendment proposed by Mr. Thom, and the amendment was lost.

The question recurring on the motion of Mr. Saylor, it was also lost.

The motion to appoint a committee of five on the Order of Business was carried. The Chair appointed, as this committee, Rev. L. T. Chamberlain of New York, Cyrus H. McCormick of Chicago, Dr. John S. Billings of Philadelphia, Robert Treat Paine of Boston and J. C. Morris of New Orleans.

The Secretary then read the following letter from Mr. Andrew Carnegie:

"It did seem to me that nothing could prevent my attendance upon the Conference at Washington whose aim is to establish an international tribunal of arbitration, for this is to me the noblest cause which appeals to us of this generation. Unfortunately, it is impossible for me to attend. But I beg you to place my name among those who identify themselves permanently with the movement. That nations will settle their differences before judges, as individuals now settle theirs, is as certain as that the sun will continue to shine. If I can be of any service to the cause in any way, I shall be a happy man. If there be any declaration of principles made, may I ask you to offer my name as one of the signers?"

Always sincerely yours,

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

P. S.—There are expenses in connection with such a movement, and it is perhaps in this line I can be of most value. I enclose a check for one thousand dollars, which please hand over to the treasurer."

MR. SMALLEY, of St. Paul, read a resolution on arbitration which had been adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul.

The Chair announced the following names of members of the Committee on Resolutions: Hon. James B. Angell of Michigan, chairman; Prof. J. B. Moore of New York, Hon. Andrew D. White of New York, Mr. Henry Hitchcock of St. Louis, Hon. J. L. M. Curry of Virginia and E. W. Blatchford of Illinois.

MR. BLACK, of Missouri, read a resolution in favor of arbitration, adopted in the city of Glasgow on the 25th of February, by the Eastern Section of the Executive Committee of the Presbyterian Alliance of Reformed Churches, representing several millions of Christian people.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN, as the chairman of the Committee on Business, moved that all resolutions be referred, not only without debate but without reading, to the Committee on Resolutions; and it was so voted.

The chair then introduced Rev. Dr. Chamberlain to speak on "The History and purposes of the Movement for the Conference."

#### ADDRESS OF REV. L. T. CHAMBERLAIN, D. D.

*Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Conference:*

To my thought, the well-nigh crowning felicity of this present hour is the fact that it gathers to itself the meaning and measure of so much that has preceded it. Necessarily anxious for the success of our cause, we may assure ourselves by the realization that that cause has allies which even this illustrious assemblage does not include. Unless tokens have lost their evidential value, there exists

a movement of which this conference is but an incident; and therein, I take it, is its power. Of course, it were of good significance if a few minds, cherishing a grand ideal, should plan for its wide adoption; but of vastly higher significance when the great inspiration falls on many hearts and the sublime purpose takes possession of many souls. Just as, after the night's darkness, it were blessed that for any reason the mountain-peaks were aglow; yet thrice blessed when that glow is recognized as from the sun's arising, and is known to be the herald of the dawn. Therefore, looking back, we recognize thankfully that this conference is part of the splendid advance begun at many points and simultaneously.

Let me say that the Queen City of the interior, moving still in the line of that greatness which prompted her once to group civilization's trophies in a display that won the admiration of the world, sent her unsolicited word to all the land and asked the friends, the lovers of judicial methods, to speak their wish on the birthday of the Father of his Country. The City of Brothely Love, true to her early traditions, and I love to think maintaining her noblest mood, heartily expressed her clear conviction, and gave new honor even to Washington's memory by invoking its power in behalf of the reasonable settlement of disputes between the nations. The great city which Puritans founded and Pilgrims helped to build, declared that judicial tribunals ought to receive all possible recognition in the attention of civilized people. The city whose imperial might is sometime thought to be in trade and traffic only, whose chief pride is sometimes said to be in the dominance of her merchants and her financiers, pledged herself, through her distinguished citizens, to unselfish advocacy of the same great cause. This beautiful city, which in her pre-eminence as the nation's capital has assured to us a hearty welcome, unconstrainedly expressed her desire for international prevalence of righteous peace and just good will. The city by the Golden Gate, the city at the Gulf, the city of the Father of Waters, other cities great and small, towns and villages, churches and philanthropic organizations, cardinal and bishops, business associations and institutions of learning, learned judges and lawyers, the religious press, many of the leaders of the daily press, civilians and soldiers alike, made known their great preference for an arbitral decision of strifes between sovereign powers, and especially strifes between this country and the motherland. Our able Secretary of State publicly averred that the greater its enlightenment the more surely does civilization perceive that its permanent interests require it to be governed by the immutable principles of right and justice. Our honored President declared his sympathy with every movement which tends to the establishment of peaceful agencies for the adjustment of international disputes. It will be remembered that, not many years ago, our Congress invited the Executive to "open negotiations with governments with which the United States has diplomatic relations, to the end that differences and disputes which cannot be adjusted by diplomacy, may be referred to arbitration, and peacefully adjusted by that means." Therefore, gentlemen, this conference, whose call was signed by representative men of the farthest West and the remotest South, as well as of the North and East, is not the device of any man or any body of men. It has been called into being by the wish of the many; it exists for the expression in one direction of the people's will.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we may safely predict that the principle which is represented here to-day is bound, on this side the ocean at least, to become

"As when the seed, enveloped in the dark,  
Has risen and cleft the soil, and grown a bulk  
Of stemless girth, that lays on every side  
A thousand arms and rushes to the sun."

Nor does it appear that on the other side of the water the progress has been either less strong or less far. By those high in church and state alike, the sentiment of Anglo-American friendliness has been declared. The Prime Minister, the leaders of both sides in the House of Commons, administrators who were formerly in place and power, primates and prelates, the press of England and Scotland alike, the chief military agencies of the United Kingdom, workmen and trade-unions, have proclaimed the atrocious folly of armed conflicts between the two great English-speaking peoples. They have recorded their faith that those peoples were competent to the framing of some method by which even international justice shall be secured through law. (Applause.)

Therefore, Mr. President, thus upheld, we open this conference for the sublime, the august purpose, that has called us from every part of our loved land. The conference has not been convened with any desire either of criticism or of rebuke. Not for an instant do we forget that we are in the presence of those whom the people, ourselves included, have elected to the control of national affairs. We claim for ourselves no monopoly of patriotic interest nor any exclusiveness of philanthropic zeal. So far from that, we are here that by comparison we may ourselves the better understand the problem. We are assembled, if I understand it, that we may thus the more clearly and properly signify the conviction of the American people concerning the need of some system of arbitration between this country and Great Britain, may the more clearly and properly signify that, not only to our own government, but to the government and the people across the sea. For one, I hope that in this conference there will be offered a detailed plan of arbitration between the two countries, a definite system of enactment and procedure. But I am perfectly certain that offering, if made, will be made as an honest and thoughtful suggestion, and not by any means as an assumed ultimatum. At the service of these who are in authority, the treaty-making power, we place both our present and our future efforts.

And, Mr. President and gentlemen, we are ready to admit, freely and in advance, that there are obstacles in the way of a permanent system of arbitration even between the United States and Great Britain. But, remembering the sacred end in view, we say, with another, that "obstacles are things to be overcome." Given an ineradicable instinct of fair play; granted the abiding fact that no nation, as no individual, lives to itself alone; admitted that history does show actual evolutions from chaos to order and from brute force to spiritual things; and I submit that it follows indubitably that it is possible to ascend from the terrific arbitrament of war to the nobler decisions of international jurisprudence. (Applause.) You might as well doubt in winter that vernal airs are possible. Only a fortnight ago, the snow-flakes nearly blinded me in these very streets, and in my northern birthplace the lingering ice defied dislodgement; but already the sun swings somewhat higher in his circle, and on every side I have heard the song of spring.

We are more than ready to admit also that war is not the worst of conceivable evils. We believe that in many instances it is, on one side at least, a fully justified alternative. The records of human progress reveal the manifold advancements that have been achieved on fields of battle. None the less wars may cease, through a cessation of the occasion, the causes of war, and yet valor take on new splendor and fortitude be lifted into still greater grandeur. In this respect also it is true that "He that saveth his life shall lose it;" and yet it is also true that with the prevalence of mutual right dealing there may well come an end of mutual slaughter.

And still, Mr. President, I linger for just one moment to emphasize the further fact that we are not under the delusion that for two nations to favor arbitration or even to adopt a properly defined system of arbitration, is a panacea. In order that there may be peace between even two nations, there must be magnanimity and truth. No system will be self-executing. Only those who honestly "seek peace and pursue it" will be its happy and permanent possessors. And yet this conference does believe that with the declared presumption, the ordained facility, the familiar procedure on the side of mutual adjustment, magnanimity and truth will be the more fostered, and harmony will be the more assured.

So may it be. May good will between the United States and Great Britain, with equity as its basis, with treaty stipulation as its seal, with enlightened public opinion as its guarantee, be the more firmly established as generations pass. (Applause.) May the great example, allying itself with kindred examples, find frequent repetition throughout the civilized world. (Applause.) God grant that the day may be hastened when all men's good shall be each man's rule; and so universal peace

"Lie like a shaft of light across the land,  
And like a lane of beams across the sea,  
Through all the circle of the golden year."

THE CHAIR asked the conference to place a limit upon the number of members of the Committee on Resolutions as he found it difficult, in the number of names, to make selection. On motion of DR. TRUEBLOOD of Boston, the number was placed at fifteen.

MR. SMALLEY, of St. Paul, asked whether the Committee on Resolutions should bring in a definite plan for the establishment of a permanent tribunal, or whether another committee should be constituted for that purpose.

THE CHAIR was of the opinion that it was within the competence of the Committee on Resolutions to report a resolution which should embody the precise form of a treaty or convention; or to present the substantial points on which such a court of arbitration could be established and leave it to some standing committee to present this suggestion to the President of the United States, the Senate, and the House of Representatives.

MR. LAWRENCE, of Ohio, moved that the Committee on Resolutions be instructed to report a plan by which international controversy may be submitted to arbitration.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN suggested, as the chairman of the Committee on Business, that this would be provided for in a more felicitous way if the committee on Resolutions were left uninstructed.

The motion was withdrawn.

MR. DONIPHAN, of Missouri, moved that the president of the conference be requested to transmit back to Mr. Carnegie his check with the thanks of this convention. He thought it not right that the conference should be

indebted to one individual for the payment of its expenses, and that an individual who was making contracts with the government for the construction of munitions of war.

MR. WEEKS, of Pittsburg, rose to object, but the Chair ruled that by the vote of the conference Mr. Doniphan's motion must be referred without debate to the Committee on Resolutions. Question being raised as to the correctness of the chair's ruling that motions were resolutions and should therefore be referred without debate, the chair asked unanimous consent that this order be applied only to resolutions bearing upon the action of the conference upon arbitration, and that all other matters be open for such action as the Conference may think fit. Consent was unanimously voted.

Upon motion of MR. WEEKS, the motion of Mr. Doniphan was then laid upon the table; and the conference adjourned.

#### SECOND SESSION.

The conference was called to order at 8 P. M. by the Chairman. A telegram was read from Bishop Watson of Eastern Carolina, as follows:

"I regret exceedingly my inability to attend the Arbitration Conference. I think the object one of incalculable importance to the happiness and morality of the world. My convictions, my wishes, and my prayers are with you."

A. A. WATSON."

THE CHAIRMAN then announced the following additional names of members of the Committee on Resolutions: Mr. Greene of New Jersey, Mr. George S. Hale of Massachusetts, Mr. Hammond of Georgia, Mr. Ingersoll of Tennessee, Mr. Kasson of Iowa, Mr. Lawrence of Ohio, Mr. Packard of Pennsylvania, Mr. Valentine of California, and Mr. Woolworth of Nebraska.

The first speaker introduced was HON. CARL SCHURZ, who spoke as follows:

#### ADDRESS OF HON. CARL SCHURZ.

I have been honored with the request that I should address you on the desirableness of arbitration as a method of settling international disputes. To show that arbitration is preferable to war, should be among civilized people as superfluous as to show that to refer disputes between individuals or associations to courts of justice is better than to refer them to single combat or to street fights—in one word, that the ways of civilization are preferable to those of barbarism.

Neither is there any doubt as to the practicability of international arbitration. What seemed an idealistic dream in Hugo Grotius' time, is now largely an established practice; no longer an uncertain experiment, but an acknowledged success. In this century not less than eighty controversies between civilized powers have been composed by arbitration. And more than that, every international dispute settled by arbitration has *stayed* settled, while during the same period some of the results of great wars have *not* stayed settled, and others are unceasingly drawn in question, being subject to the shifting preponderance of power. And such wars have cost rivers of blood, countless treasure and immeasurable misery, while arbitration has cost comparatively nothing. Thus history teaches the indisputable lesson that arbitration is not only the most humane and economical method of settling international differences, but also the most, if not the only, certain method to furnish enduring results.



As to the part war has played and may still have to play in the history of mankind, I do not judge as a blind sentimentalist. I readily admit that, by the side of horrible devastations, barbarous cruelty, great and beneficent things have been accomplished by means of war in forming nations and in spreading and establishing the rule or influence of the capable and progressive. I will not inquire how much of this work still remains to be done and what place war may have in it. But surely, among the civilized nations of to-day—and these we are considering—the existing conditions of intercourse largely preclude war as an agency for salutary objects. The steamship, the railroad, the telegraph, the postal union, and other international arrangements facilitating transportation and the circulation of intelligence have broken down many of the barriers which formerly enabled nations to lead separate lives, and have made them in those things which constitute the agencies of well-being and of progressive civilization in a very high degree dependent upon each other. And this development of common life-interests and mutual furtherance, mental as well as material, still goes on in continuous growth. Thus a war between civilized nations means *now* a rupture of arteries of common life-blood, a stoppage of the agencies of common well-being and advancement, a waste of energies serviceable to common interests—in one word, a general disaster, infinitely more serious than it did in times gone by; and it is, consequently, now an infinitely more heinous crime against humanity, unless not only the ends it is to serve fully justify the sacrifices it entails, but unless also all expedients suggested by the genius of peace have been exhausted to avert the armed conflict.

Of those pacific expedients, when ordinary diplomatic negotiation does not avail, arbitration has proved itself most effective. And it is the object of the movement in which we are engaged to make the resort to arbitration, in case of international difficulty, still more easy, more regular, more normal, more habitual, and thereby to render the resort to war more unnatural and more difficult than heretofore.

In this movement the Republic of the United States is the natural leader, and I can conceive for it no nobler or more beneficent mission. The naturalness of this leadership is owing to its peculiar position among the nations of the earth. Look at the powers of the Old World; how each of them is uneasily watching the other; how conflicting interests or ambitions are constantly exciting new anxieties; how they are all armed to the teeth and nervously increase their armaments, lest a hostile neighbor overmatch them; how they are piling expense upon expense and tax upon tax to augment their instruments of destruction; how, as has been said, every workingman toiling for his daily bread, has to carry a full-armed soldier or sailor on his back, and how, in spite of those bristling armaments, their sleep is unceasingly troubled by dreams of interests threatened, of marches stolen upon them, of combinations hatched against them, and of the danger of some accident breaking the precarious peace and setting those gigantic and exhausting preparations in motion for the work of ravage and ruin.

And then look at this republic, stronger than any nation in Europe in the number, intelligence, vigor and patriotism of its people, and in the unparalleled abundance of its barely broached resources; resting with full security in its magnificent domain; standing safely aloof from the feuds of the Old World; substantially unassail-

able in its great continental stronghold; no dangerous neighbors threatening its borders; no outlying and exposed possessions to make it anxious; the only great power in the world seeing no need of keeping up vast standing armaments on land or sea to maintain its peace or to protect its integrity; its free institutions making its people the sole master of its destinies; and its best political traditions pointing to a general policy of peace and good-will among men. What nation is there better fitted to be the champion of this cause of peace and good-will than this, so strong although unarmed, and so entirely exempt from any imputation of the motive of fear or of selfish advantage? Truly, this republic, with its power and its opportunities, is the pet of destiny.

As an American citizen, I cannot contemplate this noble peace mission of my country without a thrill of pride. And I must confess, it touches me like an attack upon the dignity of this republic when I hear Americans repudiate that peace mission upon the ground of supposed interests of the United States requiring for their protection or furtherance preparation for warlike action and the incitement of a fighting spirit among our people. To judge from the utterances of some men having the public ear, we are constantly threatened by the evil designs of rival or secretly hostile powers that are eagerly watching every chance to humiliate our self-esteem, to insult our flag, to balk our policies, to harass our commerce, and even to threaten our very independence; and putting us in imminent danger of discomfiture of all sorts, unless we stand with sword in hand in sleepless watch and cover the seas with the warships and picket the islands of every ocean with garrisoned outposts, and surround ourselves far and near with impregnable fortresses. What a poor idea those indulging in such talk have of the true position of their country among the nations of the world.

A little calm reflection will convince every unprejudiced mind that there is not a single power, not even an imaginable combination of powers, on the face of the globe that can wish—I might almost say, that can afford—a serious quarrel with the United States. There are very simple reasons for this. A war in our days is not a mere matter of military skill, nor even—as it would certainly not be in our case—a mere matter of preparation for the first onset. It is a matter of material resources, of reserves, of staying power. Now, considering that in all these respects our means are substantially inexhaustible, and that the patriotic spirit and the extraordinary ingenuity of our people would greatly aid their development in the progress of a conflict; considering that, however grievous the injuries a strong hostile navy might inflict upon us at the beginning of a war, it could not touch a vital point, as on land we would be immensely superior to any army that could be brought upon our shores; considering that thus a war with the United States, as a test of endurance, would, so far as our staying power is concerned, be a war of indefinite duration; considering all these things, I am justified in saying that no European power can engage in such a conflict with us without presenting to its rivals in the Old World the most tempting opportunity for hostile action. And no European power will do this, unless forced by extreme necessity. For the same reason no European power will, even if it were so inclined, insist upon doing anything injurious to our interests that might lead to a war with the United States. We may therefore depend upon it with absolute assur-

ance that, whether we are armed or not, no European power will seek a quarrel with us; that, on the contrary, they will avoid such a quarrel with the utmost care; that we cannot have a war with any of them, unless we want-only and persistently seek such a war; and that they will respect our rights and comply with all our demands, if just and proper, in the way of friendly agreement.

If anybody doubts this, let him look at a recent occurrence. The alarmists about the hostility to us of foreign powers usually have Great Britain in their minds. I am very sure President Cleveland, when he wrote his Venezuela message, did not mean to provoke a war with Great Britain. But the language of that message might have been constructed as such a provocation by anybody inclined to do so. Had Great Britain wished a quarrel with us, here was a tempting opportunity. Everybody knew that we had but a small navy, an insignificant standing army, and no coast defences; that in fact we were entirely unprepared for a conflict. The public opinion of Europe, too, was against us. What did the British Government do? It did not avail itself of that opportunity. It did not resent the language of the message.

On the contrary, the Queen's speech from the throne gracefully turned the message into an "expression of willingness" on the part of the United States to co-operate with Great Britain in the adjustment of the Venezuela boundary dispute.

It has been said that the conciliatory mildness of this turn was owing to the impression produced in England by the German Emperor's congratulatory dispatch to the President of the South African Republic. If the two things were so connected, it would prove what I have said, that even the strongest European government will be deterred from a quarrel with the United States by the opportunities which such a quarrel would open to its rivals. If the two things were not so connected it would prove that even the strongest European power will go to very great lengths in the way of conciliation to remain on friendly terms with this republic.

In the face of these indisputable facts, we hear the hysterical cries of the alarmists who scent behind every rock or bush a foreign foe standing with dagger in hand ready to spring upon us, and to rob us of our valuables, if not to kill us outright—or at least making faces at us and insulting the stars and stripes. Is not this constant and eager looking for danger or insult where neither exists very like that melancholy form of insanity called persecution mania, which is so extremely distressing to the sufferers and their friends? We may heartily commiserate the unfortunate victims of so dreadful an affliction; but surely the American people should not take such morbid hallucinations as a reason for giving up that inestimable blessing of not being burdened with large armaments, and for embarking upon a policy of warlike preparations and bellicose bluster.

It is a little less absurd in sound, but not in sense, when people say that instead of trusting in our position as the great peace power we must at least have plenty of warships to "show our flag" everywhere, and to impress foreign nations with our strength to the end of protecting and developing our maritime commerce. Granting that we should have a sufficient naval force to do our share of police work on the seas, would a large armament be required on account of our maritime trade? Let us see. Fifty years ago, as the official statistics of "the value of

foreign trade carried in American and in foreign vessels" show, nearly 82 per cent. of that trade was carried on in American vessels. Between 1847 and 1861, that percentage fell to 65. Then the civil war came, at the close of which American bottoms carried only 28 per cent. of that trade; and now we carry less than 12 per cent. During the period when this maritime trade rose to its highest development, we had no naval force to be in any degree compared with those of the great European powers. Nor did we need any for the protection of our maritime commerce, for no foreign power molested that commerce. In fact, since the war of 1812, it has not been molested by anybody so as to require armed protection except during the civil war by confederate cruisers. The harassment ceased again when the civil war ended, but our merchant shipping on the high seas continued to decline.

That decline was evidently not owing to the superiority of other nations in naval armament. It was coincident with the development of ocean transportation by iron steamships instead of wooden sailing ships. The wooden sailing ships we had in plenty, but of iron steamships we have only few. It appears, therefore, that whatever we may need a large war fleet for, it is certainly not for the development of our maritime commerce. To raise that commerce to its old superiority again, we want *not more warships, but more merchant vessels*. To obtain these we need a policy enabling American capital and enterprise to compete in that business with foreign nations. And to make such a policy fruitful, we need above all things peace. And we shall have that peace so long as we abstain from driving some foreign power against its own inclination into a war with the United States.

Can there be any motive other than the absurd ones mentioned, to induce us to provoke such a war? I have heard it said that a war might be desirable to enliven business again. Would not that be as wise and moral as a proposition to burn down our cities for the purpose of giving the masons and carpenters something to do? Nay, we are even told that there are persons who would have a foreign war on any pretext, no matter with whom, to the end of bringing on a certain change in our monetary policy. But the thought of plotting in cold blood to break the peace of the country and send thousands of our youths to slaughter and to desolate thousands of American homes for an object of internal policy, whatever it may be, is so abominable, so ghastly, so appalling, that I dismiss it as impossible of belief.

I know, however, from personal experience, of some otherwise honorable and sensible men who wish for a war on sentimental—aye, on high moral ground. One of them, whom I much esteem, confessed to me that he longed for a war, if not with England, then with Spain or some other power, as he said, "to lift the American people out of their materialism and to awaken once more that heroic spirit which moved young Cushing to risk his life in blowing up the Confederate steamer *Albemarle*." This, when I heard it, fairly took my breath away. And yet, we must admit, such fanciful confusion of ideas is not without charm to some of our high-spirited young men. But what a mocking delusion it is! To lift a people out of materialism by war! Has not war always excited the spirit of reckless and unscrupulous speculation, not only while it was going on, but also afterwards, by the economic disorders accompanying and outlasting it? Has it not always stimulated the rapid and often dis-



honest accumulation of riches on one side, while spreading and intensifying want and misery on the other? Has it not thus always had a tendency to plunge a people still deeper into materialism? Has not every great war left a dark streak of demoralization behind? Has it not thus always proved dangerous to the purity of republican governments? Is not this our own experience? And as to awakening the heroic spirit—does it not, while stirring noble impulses in some, excite the base passions in others? And do not the young Cushings among us find opportunities for heroism in the life of peace too? Would it be wise in the economy of the universe to bring on a war, with its bloodshed and devastation, its distress and mourning, merely for the purpose of accommodating our young braves with chances for blowing up ships? The old Roman poet tells us that it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country. It is noble, indeed. But to die on the battlefield is not the highest achievement of heroism. To live for a good cause honestly, earnestly, unselfishly, laboriously, is at least as noble and heroic as to die for it, and usually far more difficult.

I have seen war; I have seen it with its glories and its horrors; with its noble emotions and its bestialities; with its exaltations and triumphs and its unspeakable miseries and baneful corruptions; and I say to you, I feel my blood tingle with indignation when I hear the flippant talk of war as if it were only a holiday pastime or an athletic sport. We are often told that there are things worse than war. Yes, but not many. He deserves the curse of mankind who in the exercise of power forgets that war should be only the very last resort even in contending for a just and beneficent end, after all the resources of peaceful methods are thoroughly exhausted. As an American, proud of his country and anxious that this republic should prove itself equal to the most glorious of its opportunities, I cannot but denounce as a wretched fatuity that so-called patriotism which will not remember that we are the envy of the whole world for the priceless privilege of being exempt from the oppressive burden of warlike preparations; which, when it sees other nations groaning under that load, tauntingly asks, "Why do you not disarm?" and then insists that the American people, too, shall put the incubus of heavy armaments on their backs; and which would drag this republic down from its high degree of the championship of peace among nations and degrade it to the vulgar level of the bully ready and eager for a fight.

We hear much of the necessity of an elaborate system of coast fortifications to protect our seaports from assault. How far such a system may be desirable I will not here discuss. But I am confident our strongest, most effective, most trustworthy, and infinitely the cheapest coast defence will consist in "Fort Justice," "Fort Good Sense," "Fort Self-respect," "Fort Good-will," and if international differences really do arise, "Fort Arbitration."

Let no one accuse me of resorting to the clap-trap of the stump speech in discussing this grave subject. I mean exactly what I say, and am solemnly in earnest. This republic can have no other armament as effective as the weapons of peace. Its security, its influence, its happiness, and its glory will be the greater the less it thinks of war. Its moral authority will be far more potent than the heavy squadrons and the big guns of others. And this authority will, in its intercourse with foreign nations, be best maintained by that justice which

is the duty of all; by that generous regard, not only for the rights, but also the self-respect of others, which is the distinguishing mark of the true gentleman; and by that patient forbearance which is the most gracious virtue of the strong.

For all these reasons it appears to me this republic is the natural champion of the great peace measure, for the furtherance of which we are met. The permanent establishment of a general court of arbitration to be composed of representative jurists of the principal states, and to take cognizance of all international disputes that cannot be settled by ordinary diplomatic negotiation, is no doubt the ideal to be aimed at. If this cannot be reached at once the conclusion of an arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain may be regarded as a great step in that direction.

I say this not as a so-called Anglo-maniac bowing down before everything English. While I admire the magnificent qualities and achievements of that great nation, I am not blind to its faults. I suppose Englishmen candidly expressing their sentiments speak in a similar strain of us. But I believe that an arbitration agreement between just these two countries would not only be of immense importance to themselves, but also serve as an example to invite imitation in wider circles. In this respect I do not think that the so-called blood relationship of the two nations, which would make such an arbitration agreement between them appear more natural, furnishes the strongest reason for it. It is, indeed, true, that the ties binding the two peoples sentimentally together would give to a war between them an especially wicked and heinous aspect. But were their arbitration agreement placed mainly on this ground, it would lose much of its important significance for the world at large.

In truth, however, the common ancestry, the common origin of institutions and laws, the common traditions, the common literature, and so on, have not prevented conflicts between the Americans and English before, and they would not alone be sufficient to prevent them in the future. Such conflicts may, indeed, be regarded as family feuds; but family feuds are apt to be the bitterest of all. In point of fact, there is by no means such a community or accord of interest or feeling between the two nations as to preclude hot rivalries and jealousies on many fields which might now and then bring forth an exciting clash.

We hear it said even now in this country that Great Britain is not the power with whom to have a permanent peace arrangement, because she is so high handed in her dealings with other nations. I should not wonder if the same thing were said in England about the United States. This, of course, is not an argument against an arbitration agreement, but rather for it. Such an arrangement between nations of such temper is especially called for to prevent that temper from running away with calm reason. Between perfect angels from heaven an arbitration treaty would be superfluous.

The institution of a regulated and permanent system of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain would therefore not be a mere sentimental cooing between loving cousins, nor a mere stage show gotten up for the amusement of the public, but a very serious contrivance intended for very serious business. It will set to mankind the example of two very great nations, the greatest rivals in the world, neither of them a mere theorist or sentimental dreamer, both intensely practical, self-willed, and hard-headed, deliberately agreeing to abstain from the

barbarous ways of bygone times in adjusting the questions of conflicting interest or ambition that may arise between them, and to resort instead in all cases of difficulty to the peaceable and civilized methods suggested by the enlightenment, the moral sense, and the humane spirit of our age. If these two nations prove that this can be done, will not the conclusion gradually force itself upon other civilized nations that by others too it *ought* to be done, and finally that it *must* be done? This is the service to be rendered, not only to ourselves, but to mankind.

While the practicability of international arbitration by tribunals established in each case has been triumphantly proved, there is some difference of opinion as to whether a permanent tribunal is possible, whether it can be so organized as to be fit for the adjustment of *all* disputes that might come before it, and whether there would be any power behind it to enforce its adjudication in case one party or the other refused to comply. Such doubts should not disturb our purpose. Similar doubts had to be overcome at every step of the progress from the ancient wager of battle to the present organization of courts of justice. I am sanguine enough to believe that as soon as the two governments have once resolved that a fixed system of international arbitration *shall* be established between them, the same ingenuity which has been exerted in discovering difficulties will then be exerted in removing them, and most of them will be found not to exist. The end to be reached in good faith determined upon, a workable machinery will soon be devised, be it a permanent arbitration tribunal, or the adoption of an organic rule for the appointment of a special tribunal for each case. We may trust to experience to develop the best system.

Neither am I troubled by the objection that there are some international disputes which in their very nature cannot be submitted to arbitration, especially those involving questions of national honor. When the habit of such submission is once well established, it will doubtless be found that most of the questions now thought unfit for it, are entirely capable of composition by methods of reason and equality. And as to so-called questions of honor, it is time for modern civilization to leave behind it those mediæval notions according to which personal honor found its best protection in the duelling pistol, and national honor could be vindicated only by slaughter and devastation. Moreover, was not the great Alabama case, which involved points very closely akin to questions of honor, settled by international arbitration, and does not this magnificent achievement form one of the most glorious pages of the common history of America and England? Truly, the two nations that accomplished this, need not be afraid of unadjustable questions of honor in the future.

Indeed, there will be no recognized power behind a Court of Arbitration, like an international sheriff or other executionary force, to compel the acceptance of its decisions by an unwilling party. In this extreme case there would be, as the worst possible result, what there would have been without arbitration—war. But in how many of the fourscore cases of international arbitration we have witnessed in this century has such an enforcing power been needed? In not a single one. In every instance the same spirit which moved the contending parties to accept arbitration, moved them to accept the verdict. Why, then, borrow trouble where experience has shown that there is no danger of mischief? The most trust-

worthy compelling power will always be the sense of honor of the parties concerned and their respect for the enlightened judgment of civilized mankind which will watch the proceedings.

We may therefore confidently expect that a permanent system of arbitration will prove as feasible as it is desirable. Nor is there any reason to doubt that its general purpose is intelligently and warmly favored by the best public sentiment both in England and in the United States. The memorial of 233 members of the British House of Commons which, in 1887, was presented to the President and the Congress of the United States, expressing the wish that all future differences between the two countries be submitted to arbitration, was, in 1890, echoed by a unanimous vote of our Congress requesting the President to open negotiations in this sense with all countries with which we had diplomatic relations. Again this sentiment broke forth in England as well as here on the occasion of the Venezuela excitement in demonstrations of the highest respectability. Indeed, the popular desire as well as the argument seem to be all on one side. I have heard of only one objection that makes the slightest pretence to statesmanship, and it need only be stated to cover its supporters with confusion. It is that we are a young and aspiring people, and that a binding arbitration treaty would hamper us in our freedom of action.

Let the light be turned upon this. What is it that an arbitration treaty contemplates? That in all cases of dispute between this and a certain other country there shall be an impartial tribunal regularly appointed to decide upon principles of international law, of equity, of reason, what this and what the other country may be justly entitled to. And this arrangement is to be shunned as hampering our freedom of action?

What will you think of a man who tells you that he feels himself intolerably hampered in his freedom of action by the ten commandments or by the criminal code? What respect and confidence can a nation claim for its character that rejects a trustworthy and well regulated method of ascertaining and establishing right and justice, avowedly to preserve its freedom of action! Shame upon those who would have this great republic play so disreputable a part? I protest that the American people are an honorable people. Wherever its interests or ambitions may lead this great nation, I am sure it will always preserve that self-respect which will prompt it rather to court the searchlight of truth and justice than by skulking on dark and devious paths seek to evade it.

Therefore, I doubt not that the patriotic citizens assembled here to promote the establishment of a permanent system of international arbitration may be confident of having the warm sympathy of the American people behind them when they knock at the door of the President of the United States and say to him: "In the name of all good Americans we commend this cause to your care. If carried to a successful issue it will hold up this republic to its noblest ideals. It will illuminate with fresh lustre the close of this great century. It will write the name of the American people foremost upon the roll of the champions of the world's peace and of true civilization."

THE CHAIR then introduced Mr. EDWARD ATKINSON who spoke as follows:

#### ADDRESS OF EDWARD ATKINSON.

*Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:*

In order that I may disabuse your minds of any idea

that my purpose in taking part in this convention is to advocate "peace at any price," I beg to say that in presenting the economic or commercial aspect of the subject of our deliberations I shall give the reasons for an international union of the great manufacturing and commercial states which are also the great naval powers of the world, for the enforcement of peace upon the high seas by making use of their naval power to police the ocean. That end came very near its attainment in the proposal of the Congress of Nations which assembled in Paris after the Crimean War in 1856. It was then proposed to make it a rule of the ocean that privateering should be ended. The United States, wisely or unwisely, sought to add a further provision—that neutral ships should make neutral goods and that private property upon the sea should be fully exempt from seizure, except contraband of war. I believe those were the conditions of accepting the proposal presented by ourselves. These additional suggestions or conditions were not granted, and the whole proposition fell into abeyance.

Is not the time ripe for the renewal of that treaty among nations, to the end that in place of the base title of "Commerce Destroyers" the ships of the navy of this and other Christian nations may bear the honorable title of "Commerce Protectors"?

In the early part of the present century the swift cruisers of Barbary preyed upon the commerce of the inland Mediterranean. Were not those cruisers of the Barbary States practically privateers whose existence was warranted by the then existing laws of war? Were they not as fully justified as privateers would be now if they were launched to prey upon the commerce of nations by Turkey or by any of the little petty states of South or Central America? Nay, were they not as fully entitled to recognition among nations as the vessels of war of the so-called Christian states of Europe had been which but a little while before preyed upon the commerce of this country?

Is it not time that a great international naval police patrolling the high seas should abate this danger of privateering which is but another name for piracy? Yet that would not suffice for the full protection of the peaceful commerce of the world in which all nations are alike interested.

In these modern days the world has become one great neighborhood in which each land may serve the other with its abundant product. In order to render this exchange of services as ready as it may be made and to subject the distribution of products to the least cost, great sums of money have been spent by this Government in the development and improvement of its rivers and harbors. Yet more money will be expended, not only because it is for our interest but our necessity to promote this traffic to the utmost in order to dispose of our surplus products but because it is almost the necessity of all nations whom we serve that this work should be done. Yet we are at the same time taking costly measures to enable ourselves to obstruct these harbors and to make their entrance dangerous or impossible. The more we deepen and widen the channels the more we must spend to render their navigation dangerous. Is there not something supremely grotesque in this? May not "God's peace" be kept in the great ports and harbors of all lands from which the "ships may pass from this land to that like the shuttle of the loom weaving the web of concord among the nations"?

There has been some progress even in mitigating the horrors of war upon the land. Witness the symbol of the

Red Cross. Why should not the cities upon the borders of the sea which are unwallled and undefended by armed forces be brought under the humane rule of commerce and be declared free from bombardment and spoliation from the sea, making such reservations for the defence of the harbors of these cities as would forever forbid the ships of war of any petty state, which dared to disregard the order of the great nations, making an effort to enter these harbors by force for purposes of destruction? If it would disgrace the officers of an army to seek to destroy the undefended city or to plunder for their private gain the warehouses and the works of the people with whom they might be at war, why should it be imposed as a duty upon the officers of the navy to do that which would disgrace officers of an army? Why should the plunder of private property by the light troops of an army roaming at will through an undefended part of the land be held to be a base abuse of force, to be put down by a strong hand, when lightly armed vessels may be chartered as letters of marque or privateers for the plunder of the commerce of the ocean?

It is to these suggestions that I desire to call your attention. The conscience of the English-speaking people has been aroused even by the hint of possible warfare between the two great families into which they are now divided. Not only in this country but in Great Britain suggestions tending toward this great advance in the cause of peace which I have tried to develop, have been made in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Men in highest position and in office, or who have been in office under former administrations, are moving to-day upon these lines. Shall we let this opportunity pass without securing even greater safeguards for the maintenance of peace than a mere agreement to submit our disputes to arbitration? That single step in our progress is, I believe, already assured. The stand which has already been taken by representatives of every class in this country and in Great Britain; by clergy and laity, both Catholics and Protestants; by statesmen and jurists; by manufacturers and merchants; by workmen and laborers; by individualists and socialists alike, that war among kinsmen beyond the seas on whichever side they dwell shall not be tolerated except one basely attacks the other, already assures the establishment of arbitration in some form—not necessarily a permanent court, probably not preferably, but a submission of each and every cause of dispute as it arises to a tribunal qualified either as a court of law or a court of equity to report upon the rights of the case in the next twelve months—each tribunal selected with a view to the standing and qualification of its special members to deal with the subject at issue. How supremely absurd and ridiculous has the position of the Jingo in our Congress become and how superfluous any threat of war on the Venezuela boundary question since the commission of the most eminent men was appointed only on our own part to whom access has been so readily given by the government of the United Kingdom to all the evidence on which they rest their case. The mere delay required in establishing the rights in the case has sufficed, as it would in every other, to expose the pretence of patriotism which seeks only personal notoriety by appeal to passion and prejudice.

I believe that the decree which has been uttered by the people who have inherited the principles of personal liberty under the English Common Law has been heard by the Jingo of Great Britain, where that descriptive term

originated, as well as by the "pinchbeck patriots" of the United States. It has been decreed that all disputes about the title to land anywhere and all questions which may arise between the states such as between individuals would be submitted to a court of law, shall be adjudicated in an international court of highest power; that all other questions which may come to an issue, which in common practice would be submitted to a court of equity, shall be submitted to arbitration. There are those who call such plans an iridescent dream. Such scoffers are the Cheap-Jacks of our politics who thus endeavor to retard the progress of humanity.

"Shall these things come to pass?

Nay if it be—alas!

A vision, let us sleep and dream it true!

Or sane and broad awake,

For its great sound and sake,

Take it, and make it Earth's, and peace ensue!"

In justification of this economic or commercial plea for the establishment of peace and order upon the high seas, let me now develop the economic basis. All that we can get in life for our support while we dwell in these bodies is food, fuel, shelter and clothing. The different sections of the surface of the earth have been endowed with varying potentialities in the production of these necessities of life of which the chief element is food. The world is always within a year or less of starvation. It depends upon the quick and ready exchange of the products of one part of the earth for those of another, whether or not local famine shall exist. There is always an abundance for the year's supply somewhere, yet there is to-day such scarcity of food even in some of the fertile parts of the Continent of Europe as to make the conditions of life those of partial famine, accompanied by loathsome disease with constant and progressive increase in the death-rate of young children. The sole cause of these dreadful conditions is to be found in the state of passive war, under which Europe is now one great armed camp, on which nearly a thousand million dollars a year are expended and four million men are wasting the best period of their lives in camp and barracks.

The power of nations in these modern days to supply themselves with the food in which they are deficient rests only with those great manufacturing and commercial states within whose area the power of production of other goods and wares has been augmented by the application of science and invention, by the exchange of which products they procure food. The European states which come within that category number only five—the Kingdom of Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland and Belgium. These manufacturing and commercial states also constitute the greater naval powers of Europe. Each is deficient in a home supply either of food, fuel, timber, metal or fibre. By the application of science and invention to the useful arts, their power of producing manufactured goods and wares which the rest of the world needs and for which it will give crude materials, especially food, in exchange, has enabled them to bear the burdens of their standing armies and navies without yet being crushed by national debts and excessive taxation. How much longer they can bear these burdens rests to some extent upon their continued power to compete with this country in the production of manufactured goods. How long that power will last rests with us more than themselves to determine, so long as we keep free from the armaments which are impoverishing them.

Italy does not come into this category of nations, nor do many parts of southern Germany, nor does Spain. Hence we find in these sections want increasing to the extent of semi-starvation. I have lately read most fearful accounts by an eminent Italian economist of the conditions to which Italy has been brought by the burden of passive as well as of active war. One of the essential elements of food on which physical power depends is separable from other parts of the food under the title of albuminoids and that goes to support the army which must be strong, while the women starve and the children die for lack of complete nutrition.

What then is the result of these conditions upon the commerce of this country for which we may demand a peaceful way across the sea for all future time? Our huge and increasing exports have during the last ten years consisted to the extent of eighty per cent. of the excess of food and fibre which we could not consume at home. Sixty per cent. (60 per cent.) of these exports have been bought of us by Great Britain and her colonies; twenty-three per cent. (23 per cent.) by France, Germany, Holland and Belgium,—these being the several countries whose power of purchase has been augmented by science and invention. Only seventeen per cent. (17 per cent.) of our exports have passed to all other lands: less than four per cent. (4 per cent.) to South America. The British colonies only buy more from us than all the Spanish American States combined, including Mexico, Cuba, Central and South America. What is the source of our exports? During the last ten years not less than one-half that portion of our population about ten million in number, which is occupied for gain has been devoted to agriculture either upon the farm or in the secondary processes of the flour mill or the meat packing establishment. Fifteen per cent. (15 per cent.) of their product is exported on the average. It stands for the means of living to not less than fifteen hundred thousand (1,500,000) men of this country. None have such positive right to demand that commerce upon the high seas shall be defended by international agreements as the farmers of this country, whose very existence and welfare rests upon their power to serve their neighbors and their kin beyond the sea. Since I made this guarded estimate a most careful analysis has been made in the Department of Agriculture which puts the average number of men occupied on cotton, wheat and tobacco only at within a fraction of that number; add exports of provisions and dairy products and our exports of food stand for the work of over two million farmers; except for the foreign demand their products would rot upon the field or waste in their barns.

In the year 1881 the crops of Europe were very short. The wheat and flour which were exported from this country in that year sufficed, at the rate of one barrel of flour a year, which is about the customary consumption of flour in this country to each person,—to give forty million (40,000,000) persons in Europe their daily bread; they were almost wholly the inhabitants of the several states which I have already named. We then supplied at least one quarter part of the population of Great Britain and Ireland, of France, of Germany and of the Netherlands with their daily bread, and as a rule we supply nearly that proportion, saving them from famine in the years of scarcity and increasing their abundance in the years of plenty. In the same year we shipped meats and dairy products sufficient for the supply of ten million

adult workmen at the highest standard of the European consumption of such food. Their demands upon us are increasing rather than diminishing. The interdependence of the English-speaking people, aye, of the whole Teutonic family including Germany and the Netherlands, asserts itself in spite of every artificial and natural obstruction.

In those years of scarcity in Europe which occurred between 1879 and 1882 and which have been intermittent since, the grain growers of the great Mississippi valley secured the highest prices on a gold basis computed by the ton of their average grain products that they ever received. It is significant of the way in which the world, or I may say the civilized world, has become one great neighborhood that in the years 1890 to 1894 the producers of grain in the Mississippi Valley secured a larger remuneration on a gold basis for their crops of corn, oats and wheat than they had secured at the highest point of inflation from 1871 to 1884, the prices of those years being reduced to the gold standard. In the interval since 1873, the cost to the farmer of all that he buys — tools, furniture, fuel, clothing and everything else, had been reduced by a third to a half.

These prosperous conditions of our agriculture are due to the interdependence of nations and to the maintenance of peaceful commerce upon the high seas; yet under this pressure of jingoism and in pursuance of a policy of aggression and warfare this country has wasted seven millions of dollars (\$7,000,000,) or more in the construction of two basely named "Commerce Destroyers." These ships are fit for nothing except to plunder and destroy the vessels by which our abundance is distributed, on which the whole prosperity of this country rests. There is no shipping of any moment at the present time upon the high seas to be destroyed except that of our most valuable customers. Could anything be more grotesque than such folly? Yet there are men occupying high positions even if not in high repute, who would carry that waste and aggressive violence to a yet greater and greater extent. How few there are who can even imagine the huge advantage which this country enjoys in contrast to those army and debt-burdened nations of Europe, who must feed their armies though the infants die and the women starve in order that mutual service may be forbidden among the states of Europe.

We are told that we must not deal with questions of national honor on the basis of dollars and cents. To which we reply, "No, we will not. We may be trusted to defend the national honor, to maintain personal liberty and to resist aggression as fully as the most blatant jingo who prates of national honor; but we will compute the cost of jingoism — of national dishonor, of aggression, wrong and violence, in dollars and cents so that we may bring such men into contempt even by an appeal to the pockets of the people, if that be necessary."

Owing to the terrible necessity which rests upon Great Britain to maintain her existence through her sea power, her budget has been increased while our national taxation is being diminished. The cost of our National Government for twenty years has averaged but five dollars (\$5) per head of population. Under the impulse to build a new navy and to fortify the coast this charge, after having diminished to only four dollars and a quarter (\$4.25), has rapidly increased of late — yet our contribution now is only five dollars — it is being reduced relatively by the rapid increase of population. The budget of Great Britain

of the present year calls for taxation of nearly thirteen dollars (\$13) per head for national purposes only. That of France is eighteen dollars (\$18); that of Germany, adding to the imperial taxes a part of the budgets of the kingdoms and duchies which are of that nature, ten dollars (\$10) per head. Now bear in mind that the power to bear this burden is greatest in our mother country, least in France and Germany, whose debts and taxes are rapidly increasing with the magnitude of their armies and navies. When and how is the end of this horrible travesty of civilization? Who can imagine?

If our standing armies and navies were kept equal in ratio to our population to those of the three countries which I have named, about one in seventeen of arms-bearing age, it would to-day number nine hundred thousand (900,000) men. That is the tendency of our jingo policy.

It is right for us to avoid entangling alliances. It is right for us, even though our sympathies may be stirred, to keep hands off from the quarrels and armed disputes of other countries. But there may be other methods of higher potency than armed intervention through which our paramount influence may hereafter be exerted in bringing about peace, good will and plenty.

You will remark that in the relations between Great Britain and her colonies the revenue systems of the mother country and of each colony are kept separate and distinct. They are governed by entirely different motives and policies. The revenue system of Australia and Canada is as far removed from that of the mother country as our own. Hence that element interposes no barrier to a complete union of the English-speaking people of Great Britain, her colonies and the United States, for the maintenance of peaceful commerce upon the high seas.

Now assuming that the other nations of Europe which were ready to share in the effort to abolish privateering in 1856 could be joined in that undertaking, would not by far the greater part of the incentives to naval warfare be done away? Japan would quickly join, thus assuring the safety of commerce upon the well-named Pacific Ocean. Islands like the Sandwich Islands, Samoa and the like would then be neutralized, becoming the sanctuaries of free commerce. Conceive if you can the potent influence of such a union, limited if you please only to the maintenance of commerce upon the ocean. Let that be accomplished — would not the self-interest of every state in Central and South America lead them to join in that union? When these states had joined in promoting commerce upon the sea would not the potent influence of that conception begin to do away with their present methods of bad government within their own domains? Might they not then substitute election by ballot for election by bullets? Would it not become necessary to the very development of that huge and almost unknown continent of South America that the security of Anglo-Saxon institutions, of the English Common Law and of personal liberty should displace the present arbitrary and violent methods of the Spanish-American inhabitants?

Little more than a century ago the dominion of England was limited mainly to her own little island, yet forced as she had been in self-defence to maintain her sea power it has been extended as our own domain has been extended, sometimes in the most arbitrary and unjustifiable way, until eight million square miles are under her control with nearly three million more in her dependencies. Our own domain covers three million square miles aside from

Alaska. Throughout this great area of about a third of the land of the globe personal liberty is assured—the law is firmly administered—private property and rights are respected and justice is as well assured in the courts as it can be. No privileges are asserted, trade and commerce are subject to the same rules whether with the mother country or any other. No effort is made to maintain the sole control of commerce. All may join in these benefits who choose to share them.

The masses of Englishmen are right-minded, and when they choose to exert their power the classes yield to their behest. They kept the peace with this country in the Civil War and in our day of trial they forbade the small jingo class of England to put back the progress of liberty even as we now forbid the jingo class of this country to commit a foul wrong at this time. We may take many exceptions to some of the methods by which the British dominion has been extended. Have our own methods always been justifiable? Far from it. But the times have changed. Abuses which have been tolerated in the past will no longer be permitted and with the great advance in social science and in the comprehension of true politics the parting of the ways has come once more. Old methods are cast off; new lines of thought and new lines of action are before us. It has become a part of the common knowledge of every-day people that the law of commerce is service for service, product for product, benefit for benefit. Under the control of these principles by which commerce lives and moves and has its being the rules governing the mutual relations of nations must perforce be adjusted to them.

But as yet no other nation recognizes this fact except the British. In the partition of Africa only that part which will come under the English law will be open to all other nations on equal terms, whatever those terms may be. Only in that part of the hitherto unknown continent will even justice be somewhat sternly if arbitrarily administered.

What then is our duty and our opportunity as well? Shall we join in that petty jealousy which has isolated Great Britain among the European States for the very reason that her rule is that of equity and her dominion unimpaired by any effort to retain the sole control of commerce in her great domain to herself alone? Shall we hamper and restrict her as we may have lately done in her effort to protect Armenia? With whom shall we join in this ill-directed animosity and in an effort to restrict her course in the same common law which is our inheritance wherever her flag floats? Shall we ally ourselves with France, the only nation which took advantage of our supposed weakness in our Civil War to establish imperial rule in Mexico? Shall we ally ourselves with Spain in her effort to subdue Cuba? Shall we ally ourselves with the Junkers of Germany under the rule of "blood and iron"—of privilege and dynastic control? Shall we ally ourselves with Russia, as yet half civilized, even though her rule in Central Asia may be a step in civil progress for the nomadic tribes which have heretofore devastated one of the most productive sections of the world? Or shall we shut up ourselves within our own limits until by the very weight of our crops we are, as an old Hungarian friend once expressed it, "smothered in our own grease"? Shall we not rather put aside our petty jealousy, and bearing witness to the great function of English-speaking people and the charge which is upon them to establish personal liberty and the dominion of law wherever they

go, may we not now grasp the opportunity which the circumstances of the hour have put within our reach? Shall we not make such a union among the English-speaking people of the world and all others who may join as shall render it forever impossible to incite war among them and also impossible for any other state or nation to weaken the bonds of mutual service by which we may now become united? Would not that be a larger patriotism, a grander idea than has yet been developed in the world? We are proud of our States. Each is loyal to his own commonwealth. We are prouder of our nation of which the States are members since it has become free from the stain of slavery under which we were so long humiliated. May we not be prouder yet of that union with our kin beyond the seas or over our northern borderline which shall enable us to establish peace with honor, liberty and justice throughout the great domain which we control? May we not then exert an influence stronger than armed force by our example and by the prosperity which may be attained under such conditions, which will almost compel every other nation or state on either continent to emulate our example lest if they do not disarm they may become incapable even of maintaining their own people within the limit of their own domains?

Suppose such a union had been established but a few years since—suppose the rule of commerce had been enforced by the combined navies of the great Powers that in 1856 proposed to forbid privateering—suppose that the rights of nations to exchange product for product and service for service were so well assured that an attack by any single petty State upon the peaceful commerce of either were now subject to repression by all—what would be the present influence of that agreement among the great commercial nations upon the conflict in Cuba, or upon the petty conflicts in Central America? What would have been its influence upon the question at issue in Venezuela?

Will not the enforcement of peace upon the high seas and the assurance of safety to commerce speedily tend to the relief of nations from the burden of armaments upon land? In what other way can the so-called Christian World be relieved from the burden of armies? In what other way can the people of the country so fully justify the government of the people, by the people and for the people?

The last speaker of the evening was President James B. Angell of the University of Michigan.

#### ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ANGELL.

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:*—I shall detain you but a few minutes at this late hour. I am sure we are all here with one feeling, at least,—that it is a very sad commentary on the Christian civilization of our day that nineteen centuries after the coming of the Prince of Peace so many of the nations of the world should so frequently be resorting to the methods of brutes and savages rather than to the methods of reasonable beings and brethren, to settle their controversies with each other. When the savage has a contention with his neighbor, he slays him, and that ends it. In the year of grace 1870, because the King of Prussia would not promise that no Hohenzollern prince should become a candidate for the throne of Spain, Napoleon III. let loose the dogs of war, and France was deluged with the blood of thousands of innocent victims because of this petty quarrel between two sovereigns. There is hardly a foot of the soil of Europe that is not soaked deep with the blood of innocent men who have fallen



victims to princely feuds; and their blood calls to us to-night to make sure that there shall be an end to such needless butchery, if it is in our power to do anything toward that consummation.

We are met here to inquire whether we can do anything to make some permanent arbitral arrangement with Great Britain, when all the resources of diplomacy are exhausted, and, if possible, a similar arrangement between all nations.

No one needs to be told that arbitration is no new thing. It is as old as Greece. Every federation, Greek, Germanic, Dutch, Swiss, American, has resorted to it for the settlement of its difficulties. Among the most valuable services which the papacy ever rendered to humanity was the discharge of the duty of arbitrator between the great crusading nations. The Pope's work anticipated and prefigured what we, in our present dreams of human brotherhood, assign to congresses and courts of nations. Even in that rude and boisterous age it did much to familiarize men with the charms and blessings of peaceful methods of settling difficulties. What a wonder it is, and what a pity it is, that the princes of the world should not have estimated those blessings aright, but should have gone on giving loose rein to their passions, and at the outset of their quarrels hotly and hastily throwing down the gage of battle!

It would seem that our development and our history should make it very easy for us to lead in this work of arbitral adjudication. Our people have never sought war; they have often avoided it, even when they were suffering great wrong. We have had but two foreign wars in a hundred years, and a large portion of our people were bitterly opposed to both these wars. War once begun, it is true, Americans have always flung themselves, body and soul, into the conflict, with a valor and skill never surpassed elsewhere. But as long ago as the administration of Washington we first adopted those great and honorable principles of neutrality between belligerent nations which all civilized nations have now accepted, and which have done so much to restrict the evils of war. We have been carrying on arbitrations, as you have been told, for a hundred years, — eighty and more in number. For many years past, memorials and petitions have been coming up to the Capitol here, from State legislatures and from conventions and organizations of every kind, in favor of some arbitral system. The two most famous tribunals ever known to history were the Tribunal of Geneva and the recent Behring Sea Court; and the attention of all publicists throughout Europe was arrested by the adoption of an arbitration scheme by the Pan-American Conference, under the leadership of our country. (Applause.) Therefore, this is nothing new to us. We may say that we have emphasized this tendency to arbitration by showing that even great warriors love peace better than war. We may properly quote to-night those noble words of our greatest chieftain, General Grant, who on one occasion said with striking force, "I was trained as a warrior, I have participated in many battles; but I have never seen a time when, in my opinion, some way might not have been found to avoid drawing the sword. I look forward to an epoch," he continued, "when a court recognized by all nations shall settle international differences instead of loading the nations with the great burdens of supporting standing armies and navies." (Applause.) Similar words might be quoted from Wellington and from Napier; but do not these simple words

of that plain American soldier recall to us the visions and longings of poets, philosophers, and seers; the millennial peace of the old prophet Isaiah, the *Grand Projet* of those eminent Frenchmen Henry IV., Sully, and St. Pierre, the project of universal peace by that great German philosopher Emanuel Kant, and that familiar, but never too familiar vision of Tennyson when he sings of the time

"When the war-drum throbs no longer, and the battle-flags  
are furled,  
In the Parliament of Man, the federation of the world?"

Do you say, we are not here to talk of the visions of poets and seers? But we know that men of practical, hard common-sense, like Bentham the law-reformer, like Mancini the Italian statesman, like David Dudley Field the codifier of law, like those eminent men who constitute the learned Society of International Law in Europe, legislative bodies like the Swedish Diet, the Belgian Parliament, the States-General of the Netherlands, the Swiss Assembly, have all declared themselves favorably to the establishment of some kind of a court or congress for the settlement of international difficulties. Therefore, my friends, when we gather here to-night, we come not alone, but with this great cloud of witnesses about us, living and dead, who, like us, seek and have sought to substitute some peaceful remedy for the dread arbitrament of war.

It is proposed, as I understand, at this meeting, — and I think very wisely, — to limit our inquiry mainly to the practicability of establishing some arrangement with Great Britain. The establishment of a general international court, to be set up by several nations, is attended, as we all know, with most serious difficulties, — President Woolsey pointed them out with great force twenty years ago and more, — even though all the great powers were ready for it, and I think we have no evidence that they are. But certainly it is not extravagant to suppose that some such arrangement with Great Britain is possible. We have abundant evidence from across the sea, how men eminent in church and state, from great organized bodies like the recent convention of the Independent Churches, and it is said even from the government itself, would welcome some such plan. You need not to be told that there is no nation with whom our commercial and diplomatic relations are so important. War with no nation, whatever its issue, could be so calamitous to us and to the world. In the recent Venezuelan excitement, when the message of the President came upon us, startling us for a moment, it must be confessed our blood ran hot for a day; but the sober second thought of the people on both sides of the sea soon declared to us that there could be no greater calamity for us all and for mankind, than a war between these nations.

I am not altogether certain that we are not more in danger of gliding into a conflict on slight occasion than we were forty years ago. The tradition of military glory won by noble men, whom we meet every day on the streets and whom we revere and honor, is still fresh and vivid. It tends to nourish the thirst for military renown in the hearts of the young, who sometimes long to see their brows decked with such laurels as the fathers have won. And in such a mood, when a stinging word comes from the lips of a British Premier, flung off in the heat of debate like a ringing challenge, I confess it does stir the blood of our hearts and flush our cheeks and loose our tongues. We have a consciousness of military strength

since the war, of which we have reason to be proud; but which, we should not forget, has also its temptations and its dangers. It is akin to that which we see in Germany since the Franco-Prussian war. In such days as we have passed through, I think we all realize that any arrangement which should secure time for reflection on the part of both peoples would be a positive gain. (Applause.)

When we talk about arbitration, we are met with many objections only two or three of which I will make brief reference to. One of these is, as Mr. Schurz said, that there are some subjects to which it cannot be applied. This I think we should all concede. We could never submit to arbitration a question concerning our own independence or autonomy. My own opinion is that we could not submit a boundary question seriously involving the question of our territory. And I am a little more inclined than he is to think that there are questions of national insult and honor that we never would submit to, whether we ought or not! But, however that may be, there is a large group of subjects that are eminently fitted for this treatment:—questions like the consideration of the interpretation of ambiguous language in a treaty, or as to the mode of the execution of a treaty, or in respect to the rectification of a frontier where the consequences were not too great, and especially any settlement of national or individual claims. These are obvious illustrations, where many might be given.

And now as to this other objection which is raised, that we have no means of enforcing the decisions of arbitration. I should like to ask if we have not the same means of enforcing an arbitral judgment that we have now of enforcing a treaty. Do we have to resort to war to enforce a treaty with a foreign nation? Have we ever had to resort to war, or to any violence, to enforce arbitral judgments? I cannot conceive that there could possibly be an arbitral decision more distasteful to Great Britain than that in the Alabama case; but she walked up with her fifteen-million-and-a-half check promptly. And for one, I hope never to see a decision more distasteful to me than the Halifax decision was. I refer to these because I consider them the most conspicuous illustrations possible of distasteful arbitral judgments between us and Great Britain. And yet we abided by them, and here we are. It gives as good historical assurance as any possible facts can, that we shall have no trouble about arbitral judgments between Great Britain and ourselves.

One other, and the last: It is said that we are a lot of sentimentalists, who do not know much about practical life, college professors and the like; and that is unhappily true of some of us. It is said that we imagine that by some kind of legislation or negotiation we can suppress the passions of men, and put an end to war. I think I voice the feelings of this Conference when I say that we have no such expectation, during our generation. I wish we had; but the hard facts are plain enough to every eye. We do hope to diminish the number of wars. We do hope that, if our example shall be followed by the great nations of Europe, it may do something to lift from those millions of toilers these dreadful burdens of which Mr. Atkinson has been telling us. If these are dreams, they are noble dreams, and we will keep dreaming! But none of us expect, I take it, that war is to be done away with at once. None of us expect that we are to disband our little army. We must keep the army that we have, for the mere exercise of police power. And I think we cannot diminish our navy. I am inclined not to speak in quite so strong terms about the naval force as Mr. Atkin-

son; I think we do need as many vessels as we have, to represent us in all the various countries of the world where our citizens are. But there is no need of burdening this nation with the heavy load of the support of a navy. We can get on substantially as we are getting on at the present time. We have no idea of pursuing any vagaries, any hallucinations, that have no solid foundation in fact. What we propose is that this nation shall take an attitude before the nations of the world, manly, brave, noble, showing that it is ready to defend itself whenever there is need, as becomes a people who believe that there are some calamities more dreadful than war; but at the same time that we shall make no claims but just claims on foreign nations, and that we shall show our faith in the justice of our claims by our willingness to submit them to the decision of a properly constituted, impartial court. And when we have done this, we will leave to them every question except those that involve our independence and our honor. When this nation and Great Britain have set that example before the nations of the world, we may believe that we shall have taught them, not only that great lesson of civil liberty which it has been the mission of England and the United States to teach, but also that other lesson, greater and nobler, if possible, the lesson of peace and justice in the settlement of our quarrels. (Applause.)

The Conference then adjourned.

## THE ARBITRATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN BASSETT MOORE.

(CONCLUDED.)

After first making a naval demonstration, the United States by a convention signed February 4, 1859, agreed to arbitrate the claim made against Paraguay by the United States and Paraguay Navigation Company. A commission composed of a representative of each Government decided August 13, 1860, that the claim was not well founded. On the ground that the convention admitted liability and that the commissioners, by going into the merits of the case, had exceeded their competency, the United States repudiated the award, and has since endeavored to settle the claim by negotiation.

Another arbitration not permitted to end agitation was the submission to Louis Napoleon, under a treaty signed February 26, 1851, of the claim made by the United States against Portugal for the latter's nonfulfillment of neutral duty, in suffering the destruction on September 27, 1814, in the port of Fayal, in the Azores, of the American privateer General Armstrong by a British fleet. The arbitrator held that the privateer was the aggressor, and made an award adverse to the claim. On various grounds, among which was the charge that the case of the United States was incompletely submitted, the claimant sought to have the award set aside. This course the United States very properly declined to take, but it subsequently paid the claimants from its own treasury. Another arbitration between the United States and Portugal, under a protocol signed in 1891, to which Great Britain is also a party, respecting the seizure by the Portuguese Government of the Delagoa Bay Railway and the annulment of its charter, is now pending before three Swiss jurists at Berne.

Under a convention concluded November 10, 1858, the United States and Chile referred to the King of the Belgians a claim growing out of the seizure of the proceeds of the cargo of the American brig *Macedonian* by the